

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Information Disclosure Statement filed May 10, 2007 in view of the reasons that follow.

Initially, Applicant respectfully believes that the May 10, 2007 submission entirely met the Information Disclosure Statement requirements of 1.97(d). As for the concise explanation of the references, MPEP § 609.04(a) states that providing an English language abstract may fulfill the requirement, as does an English language version of an action by a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application which indicates the degree of relevance found by the foreign office. Here, both have been provided.

Nonetheless, and while not required to fulfill the disclosure requirements, Applicants are herewith submitting publicly-available machine-generated English translations for the three JP documents, listed in the attached SB/08 as documents A5-A7.

As for the two remaining WO references, enclosed are documents A1 and A2 whose identification can be easily be publicly ascertained through a patent family search. Documents A1 and A3 belong to the same "patent family," whereby the English language document may assist the PTO in understanding the content of the non-English language document. Further, Documents A2 and A4 belong to the same "patent family," whereby the English language document may assist the PTO in understanding the content of the non-English language document.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner initial the enclosed updated SB/08 form, which lists the same non-English language references as with the May 10 submission, along with two U.S. references that are counterparts of two of the non-English language references.

Finally, to avoid any later misunderstanding of the file, Applicant respectfully restates the point made in the May 10 filing that the submission of any document herewith, which is not a statutory bar, is not intended as an admission that such document constitutes prior art against the claims of the present application or that such document is considered material to patentability as defined in 37 CFR §1.56(b).

To the extent that the Examiner has any remaining concerns about the IDS that was filed, or believes that any remaining deficiency exists, he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned by telephone before issuing any further communication.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 22, 2007

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,888